

Because this Court lacks the power to vacate a state court decision authorizing foreclosure, Plaintiff's motion is denied. *See, e.g., In re Madera*, 586 F.3d 228, 232 (3d Cir. 2009) (holding that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine bars an action which is inextricably intertwined with a state court's foreclosure judgment). Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, and as such may only hear cases they have been authorized to hear by the Constitution or by statute. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). Under what has come to be known as the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine lower federal courts, such as federal district courts, lack subject matter jurisdiction over challenges to state court judgments. *Lance v.*

Dennis, 546 U.S. 459, 463 (2006). Federal jurisdiction to review state court judgments is vested exclusively in the United States Supreme Court. *Lemons v. St. Louis County*, 222 F.3d 488, 492 (8th Cir. 2000). The *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine recognizes this and forecloses not only straightforward appeals from state court decisions, “but also more indirect attempts by federal plaintiffs to undermine state court decisions.” *Id.* The doctrine prohibits lower federal courts from exercising jurisdiction over all “general constitutional claims that are inextricably intertwined with claims already adjudicated in state court.” *Id.* at 492-93. A general federal claim is inextricably intertwined with a state judgment “if the federal claim succeeds only to the extent that the state court wrongly decided the issues before it.” *Pennzoil Co. v. Texaco, Inc.*, 481 U.S. 1, 25 (1987). That is, the doctrine bars claims where the requested federal relief would void the state court’s judgment or essentially reverse the state court’s holding. *Ace Constr. v. City of St. Louis*, 263 F.3d 831, 833 (8th Cir. 2001).

In the present case Plaintiff is alleging that Defendants lacked standing to foreclose on his property, a claim that, if true, would obviously undermine the Missouri state court decision permitting foreclosure. Consequently, under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, Plaintiff’s motion must be DENIED.

Because the Court has ruled on the merits of Plaintiff’s motion, Defendant’s motion is DENIED AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: August 15, 2011

/s/ Greg Kays
GREG KAYS, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT